

## REMARKS

### Claims 1-6, 8-14, and 16-22 are Allowable

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-6, 8-14, and 16-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Cohen (US 6,477,595 B1) on page 2 of the Office Action, Cohen fails to teach or suggest each and every element of these claims. With respect to claim 1, Cohen fails to teach or suggest "blocking logic responsive to detection logic, the blocking logic to selectively initiate a blocking signal to disable communications from the second interface from being sent over the first interface to the end-user computer." Cohen discloses a system for connecting multiple DSL modems to a wide area network through a DSL multiplexer. The DSL multiplexer contains a plurality of modems (called "CO" modems) that communicate with "end stations" through a local modem (called CP modems). These end stations are desktop computers, either standalone or connected to a local area network. Cohen, col. 5, lines 54-59. Cohen discloses that a CP DSL modem is connected to each end station. See Fig. 2A, 2B and col. 5, line 64 – col. 6, line 2. These CP modems may be pooled, so that a particular CP modem may serve more than one end station. If a particular CP modem detects inactivity at an end station, the CP modem issues a signal to its CO modem in the multiplexer and the corresponding CO modem then goes into a standby mode.

Cohen fails to disclose or suggest that the CO modem in standby mode blocks any communication to the end station through the CP DSL modem. If, for example, a communication is sent from the wide area network to the end user computer while the CO modem is in standby mode, there is no teaching or suggestion in Cohen that the CO modem will block and not transmit the communication to the end station through the CP modem. Accordingly, Cohen fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1.

With respect to claim 10, Cohen fails to teach or suggest "blocking data originating from the second wide area data network connection from being communicated to the first local data connection to establish a blocking condition." As set forth above, Cohen does not teach or disclose blocking communications to an end-user computer. Accordingly, Cohen fails to teach each and every element of claim 10.

With respect to claim 19, Cohen fails to teach or suggest "during a first period of time, blocking data received from the second port of the digital subscriber line routing equipment from being communicated by the first port of the digital subscriber line routing equipment." As set forth above, Cohen does not teach or disclose blocking communications to an end-user computer. Accordingly, Cohen fails to teach each and every element of claim 19.

With respect to claims 2-6, 8-9, 11-14, 16-18 and 20-22, Cohen fails to teach each and every limitation of these claims, at least by virtue of their dependency from one of claims 1, 10, or 19.

Furthermore, with respect to dependent claim 6 as an example, Cohen fails to teach or suggest the claimed element "wherein the detection logic and blocking logic are embedded within an auto-sensing Ethernet port." While Cohen does disclose that the CP modem detects activity at an Ethernet port, Cohen fails to teach or suggest that this Ethernet port is auto-sensing. Accordingly, Cohen fails to disclose or suggest an additional element of claim 6.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claims 1-6, 8-14, and 16-22 is improper and withdrawal of this rejection therefore is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 7 and 15 are Allowable**

Regarding the rejection of claims 7 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Cohen in view of Gerszberg (US 6,510,152 B1) on page 6 of the Office Action, as set forth above, Cohen fails to teach or suggest the specific combination of these claims, at least because of their dependency on claims 1 and 10, respectively. With respect to claim 7, Gerszberg also does not teach "blocking logic responsive to detection logic, the blocking logic to selectively initiate a blocking signal to disable communications from the second interface from being sent over the first interface to the end-user computer." With respect to claim 15, Gerszberg also does not teach "blocking data originating from the second wide area data network connection from being communicated to the first local data connection to establish a blocking condition."

Furthermore, there is no suggestion in either Cohen or Gerszberg that the references be combined. In particular, Gerszberg discloses a "set-top box" to allow an interexchange carrier to

access telephone lines or cable lines before those lines enter the switching technology of local telephone carriers. Gerszberg, col. 2 lines 27-43. Gerszberg does not address the blocking of data to an end user computer from a wide area network. Furthermore, Gerszberg does not address and is not related to the area of multiplexing multiple DSL modems, as described by the Cohen patent. Accordingly, there is no motivation, teaching or suggestion for one of skill in the art to combine the Cohen and Gerszberg references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claims 7 and 15 is improper and withdrawal of this rejection therefore is respectfully requested.

**New claims 23-30 are Allowable**


New claims 23-30 have been added. Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references teach or suggest the specific combination of elements in any of the newly added claims. Accordingly, consideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney or agent.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

3-21-2005  
Date

  
Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, L.L.P.  
5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265  
Austin, Texas 78746  
(512) 327-5515 (phone)  
(512) 327-5452 (fax)